

Examiner question para ref	Examiner question	Seagry Parish council response	WC response
5	<p>I would be pleased if Wiltshire Council could check and confirm whether its Regulation 16 comments actually relate to the Submission Version of the Plan. The reason I raise this, is that parts of the submission refer to wording that I do not recognise in the version of the plan I have e.g. the wording of the Vision. Equally the comments refer to policy numbers, which do not tally with the policy numbers in the Submission Version, but were I suspect the numbers used at the Reg 14 stage.</p>		<p>Some of the text commentating on the vision is still appropriate but some is left over from the previous version of the text and should read:</p> <p>Considering the proposed Vision in more detail, terms such as “existing patterns” and [having] “minimum impact on ecology and heritage” could usefully be explained and defined by evidence to assist the user of the Plan.</p> <p>For 5.13 Permeable Surfacing the policy number is SNP9 and the reference to SNP11 is an oversight based on the previous version of the plan’s numbering.</p> <p>And again the reference to SNP12 under Community Facilities is based on the previous reference and should be SNP13.</p>
6	<p>Can the Parish Council provide me with a copy of the Valued Views Report (2019)?</p>	<p>Email sent from parish council</p>	

7	In terms of View 3 at the time, I made my visit any view across to the Church was obliterated by the tall maize growing in the field, which was awaiting harvesting. I understand that may be a temporary situation, but is there a photograph that illustrates the view from the viewpoint, so that I can be satisfied that such a view exists as described?	Parish Council to respond	
8	I saw the View 6, but I think it refers to a view experienced from the gate into the field rather than the position shown by the arrow on the plan.	Parish Council to respond	
9	Finally, I am assuming that the multi – directional views towards the cross road and the triangle shown as View 7, are all views along the public highway, rather than across private land. Can this be confirmed by the Parish Council.	Parish Council to respond	
10	If I am to consider these 11 assets to be heritage assets, albeit non designated heritage assets, then I need to see evidence which sets out their significance as heritage assets. Can the Parish Council provide me with details as to why these particular properties have been identified?	Parish Council to respond	
11	<p>I note that the policy identifies as a heritage asset, the Spitfire Memorial, but I question whether it meets the definition of a heritage asset, as set out in the Glossary of the NPPF. Map 4 includes all the grass verge either side, rather than just the extent of the stone memorial. It does seem to me that the importance of this area could possibly be more appropriately protected by the whole area being designated as a Local Green Space, which covers the defined area including the memorial's setting, rather than the stone memorial. I would be interested in the Parish Council's response to this possible change, which I could make as a recommendation.</p> <p>Additional question (email 24/10/19): Can I ask you to seek an indication from Wiltshire Council as land owner as to whether it would have any objections /</p>	Email sent from parish council	<p>Wiltshire Council can confirm that the Spitfire Memorial land is owned by Wiltshire Council, Registered Title WT122824.</p> <p>However, the land is adopted public highway and therefore requesting highways to advise on the request for the land to be allocated green space.</p>

	comments in relation to the proposed LGS designation. I imagine the land is designated highway in any case.		
12	I am interested in what is being specifically protected in terms of the Hole in the Wall Footpath – the policy itself refers to the “buildings and structures” – is it the wooden stile, that is of significance, or is the walls either side that enclose the footpath, which are actually part of the adjacent buildings, which are not protected. I note that there is a separate policy that covers footpaths as local rights of way.	Parish Council to respond	
13	This policy covers, by implication, <i>all</i> development proposals. Is it appropriate for all developments to have to demonstrate compliance, would it be expected for domestic alterations, or is it new housing/ buildings on green field sites? What is the expectation as to how an applicant would satisfy the policy – is it expected that there would be a need for an ecological survey and report or is just development that could impact on the areas identified in Map 5?	Parish Council to respond	
14	Does not Core Strategy Policy 50 already cover development within the parish and how does the neighbourhood plan introduce additional requirements relating to biodiversity and the natural environment, apart from identifying the areas shown in Map 5, alongside Policy 51 and 52? The text suggest the policy <i>reinforces</i> the protection in these policies, but my issue is what does the policy actually, add to the local plan policies. I have noted that the plan has chosen not to have a separate policy covering Green infrastructure.	Parish Council to respond	
15	The policy refers to <i>informal</i> local paths. Does the public have rights to use these routes – are they permissive paths? Can those sections of the routes, that are not designated rights of way, be shown on a map, to enable a decision maker to have regard to them, when determining a planning application?	Parish Council to respond	

16	I have seen the objection from a resident, who has a desire to create a vehicular access across the land at Broadleaze, so as to provide on-site parking for their vehicles. Could the Local Planning Authority confirm whether the creation of such an access would require planning permission and whether the proposed policy would rule out such an access being approved, in principle.		Based on the info I have available I would say that creation of a new access including dropping of kerb & laying of hardstanding would require planning permission and possibly a separate consent from the Highways Authority. Looking at the draft policy SNP5, the designation and the supporting text I would have to conclude that there would be conflict between such a proposal and the policy if adopted.
17	Again, I would welcome the Parish Council's views as to the land described as the Spitfire Memorial could better be described as an area of green space which is demonstrably special to the local community, having a particular local significance as the site of the Spitfire Memorial.	Parish Council to respond	
18	Should the policy point an applicant to a document or a source, that sets out what the housing need of the village is set out?	Parish Council to respond	
19	What parts of the village are considered <i>sensitive landscape areas</i> and should these be shown on a map?	Parish Council to respond	
20	Can the Parish Council point out to me any areas of "existing sporadic loose knit areas of development related to Upper Seagry" which would rule out "infill development"?	Parish Council to respond	
21	I do not consider that a policy which states that a proposal will be considered on their merits, to be a planning policy, as it gives no indication as to how a decision maker should be determining a planning application, having regard to Section 38 of the Town and Country Planning Act – the presumption in favour of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I assume that	Parish Council to respond	

	<p>the intention is that these applications will be considered against other relevant policies in the development plan, which are already covering the plan area and the intention is that the neighbourhood plan is intended to be silent on their acceptability.</p>		
22	<p>Is “<i>in principle</i>” support to be given to custom or self-build projects, irrespective of the site’s location?</p>	Parish Council to respond	
23	<p>Can the Parish Council clarify in what ways, new development will be expected to make appropriate contributions to the retention and enhancement of existing facilities? Would it only be particular types of development e.g. residential? Would not any financial contributions be covered by any CIL payments made, as the Parish Council would receive 25% of contributions or is the Parish Council looking for Section 106 payments, in which case can such payments be said to meet the requirements set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. I would be grateful if Wiltshire Council can say whether such community facilities are covered by its Regulation 123 list, and so effectively an applicant is being expected to pay twice. Regulation 122 says states that financial contributions can only be made if the contribution is related to the development, is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>	Parish Council to respond	